IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY EIGHTH DAY OF JUNE
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

-

WRIT PETITION No.15970 of 2001

Between:

Epuru Sudhakar S/o. Chinna Rama Subbaiah,
Nandikotkur (V), Kurnool District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

The Superintendent of Police, Kurnool.

.....RESPONDENT

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, Order or Direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the Respondent in withdrawing the Security Personnel for the petitioner herein without any reason is illegal and arbitrary and consequently direct the Respondent to provide two Armed Police Constable for the Petitioner.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.MANOHAR REDDY MALLASANI

Counsel for the Respondent: GP FOR HOME

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

The petitioner is a native of Nandikotkur village. He states that in October, 1995 when he was going along with another on a motor cycle, the accused persons in Crime No.30 of 1995 of P.S.Bollavaram attacked him. His father and one Ambi Reddy were also victims of the attack as a result of which, his father and Ambi Reddy died. The petitioner gave a complaint which was registered as Crime No.30 of 1995 and later committed to the Court of Sessions and numbered as S.C.No.404 of 1996 on the file of the Court of I Additional Sessions Judge, Kurnool. In view of this, apprehending threat to his life, he made representation to the respondent for providing protection, in vain. Therefore, he filed the present writ petition seeking direction to the respondent to give police protection to the petitioner.

The matter was admitted on 03.8.2001. On 03.4.2002 this Court directed the respondent to dispose of the representation of the petitioner dated 23.2.2002 within a period of one week from the date of receipt of that order. In fact, in view of the said order, nothing survives in the writ petition. This Court in **G. Subas Reddy v. State of A.P.** and **R.Venkateswara Rao v. State of A.P.** dealt with the matter and in **G.Subas Reddy**'s case observed that whenever there is a threat perception to the life of a person, such person has to approach the Superintendent of Police concerned for providing police security. This Court also issued guidelines. Following those guidelines, the Government Andhra Pradesh in Home Department issued G.O.Ms.No.655 dated 13.3.1997. These guidelines deal with the persons who were entitled to the police protection and the competent authority who can provide such police protection subject to review once in three weeks regarding threat perception to life. Therefore, whether or not representation made by the petitioner is considered, it shall be open to the petitioner to approach the respondent, who is directed to take action in accordance with Government orders in

G.O.Ms. No.655 dated 13.3.1997.

The writ petition, with the above observations, is disposed of.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO,J)

28.06.2005

YS

To

1. The Superintendent of Police, Kurnool.

2. Two CCs to the Government Pleader for Home, High Court Buildings,

Hyderabad. (OUT)

3. Two C.D. Copies.